



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,297	02/15/2002	Shih Chieh Lin	LINS3016/EM	8980
23364	7590	05/07/2004	EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			CHO, UN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2682	2

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/075,297	LIN, SHIH CHIEH
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Un C Cho	2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Regarding claim 2, the claim limitation is unclear whether what the applicant is trying to convey regarding the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 1^{2, Zare} rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hong et al. (US 2002/0128050).

Regarding claim 1, Hong teaches a battery for an electronic device having a first wireless mobile device (Fig. 6, 100) having a controller (not shown) and a battery device (Fig. 6, 200) for supplying power to the controller and at least one second wireless mobile device (Fig. 6, 300) powered by a battery device (not shown), wherein the second wireless mobile device is electrically connected to the first mobile device (Fig. 6, 400) so that the battery device of the first wireless mobile device is connected with the battery device of the second wireless mobile device for supplying power to the controller (not shown) of the first wireless mobile device (Hong, Paragraph 0025, lines 1 – 8).

Regarding claim 2, Hong teaches the limitation of claim 1 and at least one second wireless mobile device connected with another mobile device having batteries cascaded together (Fig. 6) (Hong, Paragraph 0025, lines 1 – 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong in view of Satoh et al. (US 6,643,527).

Regarding claim 3, Hong teaches the limitations of claim 1. However, Hong fails to teach a voltage stabilizer arranged between the load device and the

battery device of the first wireless mobile device. In contrast, Satoh teaches a voltage stabilizer (Fig. 2, 51) arranged between the control unit (Fig. 2, 60) and the battery device (Fig. 2, 80) of a portable telephone (Fig. 1, 10) (Satoh, Col. 3, lines 49 – 56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Satoh to Hong to provide a power switching unit of a portable telephone having a data storage function such as an electronic pocket notebook function that can be used even if a supply voltage from a battery drops.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong in view of Satoh as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of von Ruti (US 3,749,946).

Regarding claim 4, Hong as modified by Satoh teaches the limitations of claim 3. However, Hong as modified by Satoh fails to teach the voltage stabilizer being a zener diode. In contrast, von Ruti teaches that the voltage stabilizer comprises of a zener diode (von Ruti, Col. 3, lines 24 – 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of von Ruti to Hong and Satoh to provide an electrical circuit comprising a voltage stabilizer to prevent the supply of the amplifier circuit creating an interference voltage at the screen.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong in view of Nakanishi et al. (US 5,177,426).

Regarding claim 5, Hong teaches the limitations of claim 1. However, Hong fails to teach a switch device arranged between the load device and an electrode of the battery device of the first wireless mobile device, first and second connectors connected to two terminals of the switch device and a detecting device arranged between the first connector and the second connector for disconnecting the switch device when detecting an electrical connection and otherwise conducting the switch device. In contrast, Nakanishi teaches a switching circuit (Fig. 2, 10) arranged between the load (Fig. 2, 8) and the battery (Fig. 2, 7) of the handset (Fig. 2, B), first and second connectors (Fig. 2, 2 and 3) connected to two terminals of the switching circuit and switch control circuit (Fig. 2, 9) arranged between the first connector and the second connector for disconnecting the switching circuit when detecting an electrical connection and otherwise conducting the switching circuit (Nakanishi, Col. 3, lines 12 – 46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Nakanishi to Hong to provide over-discharge protection circuitry for the battery charging circuit in a portable apparatus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Un C Cho whose telephone number is (703)305-8725. The examiner can normally be reached on M ~ F 8:00AM to 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on (703)308-6739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Un C Cho 5/3/04 uc
Examiner
Art Unit 2682


VIVIAN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

5/3/04